

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7 have been amended. Claims 36-58 have been added. Claims 1-8 and 36-58 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

### 5        § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,054,906 to Levosky (hereinafter “Levosky”).

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levosky in view of US Publication No. 2004/0177110 to Rounthwaite et al.  
10 (hereinafter “Rounthwaite”).

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office’s rejections.

### The Claims

**Claim 1** has been amended and, as amended recites a pseudonymous email  
15 address generator comprising:

- a request interface configured to receive a pseudonymous email address generation request for an entity, the request containing website identification information *including at least an IP address associated with the entity*; and
- 20 • a computer-readable medium embodying computer-readable instructions that implement a pseudonymous email address creator configured to:
  - create a pseudonymous email address associated with a mail server in response to the received pseudonymous email address generation request,
  - 25 ○ associate the pseudonymous email address with an email address,

- provide the created pseudonymous email address and its associated email address to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address,
- provide the created pseudonymous email address to the entity; and
- store the website identification information with the associated pseudonymous email address to allow centralized analysis *to ascertain whether the IP address is associated with a source of spam.*

10 Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification, in ¶¶ [0045] and [0046]. In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is obvious over Levosky. Applicant respectfully disagrees and, for the reasons set forth below, traverses the Office's rejections.

This claim has been amended to recite that the website identification  
15 information includes *at least an IP address associated with the entity* and that the centralized analysis is *to ascertain whether the IP address is associated with a source of spam.*

Levosky fails to disclose, teach, or suggest any such subject matter. In point of fact, Levosky *teaches directly away* from any such subject matter by  
20 specifically instructing that the *user* has the task of reviewing the history of various messages received for the purpose of ascertaining whether the messages constitute spam. See, e.g., column 6, line 44+. Specifically, Levosky instructs that a log is maintained on an Alias E-mail server and that the log can be accessed and reviewed by a user by clicking on a particular button. Levosky further  
25 instructs that, by virtue of reviewing the history of various messages, the sender

may choose to block or filter the messages. See, e.g., column 6, lines 60-63. Levosky further instructs that a user may decide to block or suspend forwarding of the messages from the Alias E-mail server by means of a check box. See, e.g., column 7, lines 1-4. The user may also decide to filter a message associated with the particular alias by clicking on a filter button. See, e.g., column 7, lines 5-8. In addition, the user may set up filters to either allow only certain e-mail messages coming from certain character combinations in an e-mail “from” header. See, e.g., column 7, lines 9-15. Levosky further instructs that to use this feature, one of the check boxes “*must*” be checked.

Levosky in no way contemplates the notion of a centralized analysis to ascertain whether the IP address is associated with a source of spam. As pointed out above, Levosky teaches directly away from any such subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the Office’s rejection is traversed.

**Claims 2-8** depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

### **New Claims**

**Claims 36-58** have been added. No new subject matter has been added. These claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reason that the references do not disclose or suggest using an IP address to monitor requests for

pseudonymous e-mail addresses to ascertain whether the IP address is associated with a source of spam.

5           **Conclusion**

          All of the claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of  
10   scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

15           Dated:7/17/2009

By: /Lance R. Sadler/  
Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38605  
(509) 755-7251